



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/642,632	08/18/2000	Bertrand Serlet	004860.P2440	8235

7590 10/09/2003

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/642,632

Applicant(s)

SERLET ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2155

Detailed Action

Claims 1-44 are pending in this Office Action.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Page 2, lines 6, 10 and 27.

Page 3, lines 8, 9 and 10.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11, 15, 16, 23, 24, 30-35, 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 by Abdelnur et al. (“Abdelnur”)

Regarding claim 1, a system comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

a plurality of web servers (Abdelnur: col. 1, line 25; col. 2, 21-33) running the distributed authoring and versioning (WebDAV) enabled hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) coupled to the internet (Abdelnur: col. 8, lines 28-32; col. 4, lines 15-26); and

a plurality of personal computers coupled to the internet (Abdelnur: col. 2, line 21-23), each personal computer comprising an operating system extension that forwards file system requests involving file systems (Abdelnur: col. 2, lines 43-47; col. 10, lines 41-53; col. 6, lines 28-32) stored on one of the plurality of web servers to a network access application program on the personal computer that sends the file system requests as at least one WebDAV or HTTP request to an appropriate web server. (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 15-35)

Regarding claim 2, the system of Claim 1, wherein the network access application program processes a plurality of responses to the file system requests received as WebDAV or HTTP packets and passes the responses to the operating system extension, which forwards information from the responses. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 40 – 59; where the Network File System “NFS” acts like the network access application)

Regarding claim 3, the system of Claim 2 wherein the file system requests involving file systems stored on one of the plurality of web servers originate from an operating system client (Abdelnur: col. 10, lines 41-53), and the information from the responses is forwarded to the operating system client. (Abdelnur: col. 10, lines 41-53; lines 64-67)

Regarding claim 4, the system of Claim 3 wherein the operating system client is any of a plurality of user accessible application programs. (Abdelnur: Abstract; col. 1, lines 31-34; col. 4, lines 46-50)

Regarding claim 5, the system of Claim 4 wherein the operating system extension and the network access application program communicate with each other via sockets.

Art Unit: 2155

(Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 20 –23; and sockets are an inherit input and output vehicle for TCP/IP communication)

Regarding claim 6, a method comprising:

receiving a file system request involving a remote file system; (Abdelnur: col. 3, line 6, col. 2, lines 34-35)

creating a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) or distributed authoring and versioning (WebDAV) formatted request (HTTP/WebDAV formatted request); (Abdelnur: col. 3, lines 6-10; col. 4, lines 15-20)

forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server; (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 28-32)

receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server; and (Abdelnur: col. 4: 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55)

transferring an information contained in the response. (Abdelnur: col. 4: 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55; col. 8, lines 41, 42)

Regarding claim 7, the method of Claim 6 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining the file system request from an operating system extension. (Abdelnur: col. 28-32)

Regarding claim 8, the method of Claim 6 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a request type. (Abdelnur: col. 5, lines 6-16; col. 2, lines 42-45)

Regarding claim 9, the method of Claim 8 wherein creating comprises:

selecting an appropriate WebDAV/HTTP method responsive to the request type. (Abdelnur: col. 7, lines 47-56)

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 10, the method of Claim 6 further comprising:
extracting an information from the response. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 53-55)

Regarding claim 11, the method of Claim 10 wherein extracting comprises:
converting a WebDAV/HTTP status code to a corresponding local operating
system error code. (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 32-34; col. 11, lines 53-57)

Regarding claim 15, a method comprising:
receiving a file system request from an application program via an application
program interface; (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 22-32)
if the file system request involves a remote file system, forwarding the file system
request to a network access application program that creates a corresponding hypertext
transfer protocol (HTTP) or distributed authoring and versioning protocol (WebDAV)
formatted request (HTTP/WebDAV formatted request); (Abdelnur: col. 3, lines 6-10; col.
4, lines 15-20; col. 6, lines 28-32)
forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV
enabled HTTP server over the Internet; (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55)
receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server in WebDAV or
HTTP format such that the network access application program creates a reformatted
response; and (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55; col. 8, lines 36-42)
transferring the reformatted response to the application program via the
application program interface. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 55-59)

Regarding claim 16, the method of Claim 15 wherein receiving a file system
request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a request type.
(Abdelnur: col. 5, lines 6-16; col. 2, lines 42-45)

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 23, a machine-readable medium having stored thereon instructions which when executed by a processor cause the machine to perform operations comprising: (Abdelnur: col. 12, lines 42-48)

receiving a file system request from an application program via an application program interface; (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 22-32)

if the file system request involves a remote file system, forwarding the file system request to a network access application program that creates a corresponding hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) or distributed authoring and versioning protocol (WebDAV) formatted request (HTTP/WebDAV formatted request); (Abdelnur: col. 3, lines 6-10; col. 4, lines 15-20; col. 6, lines 28-32)

forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server over the Internet; (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55)

receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server in WebDAV or HTTP format such that the network access application program creates a reformatted response; and (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55; col. 8, lines 36-42)

transferring the reformatted response to the application program via the application program interface. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 55-59)

Regarding claim 24, the machine readable medium of Claim 23 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource locator (URL) and a request type. (Abdelnur: col. 5, lines 6-16; col. 2, lines 42-45)

Regarding claim 30, a machine-readable medium having stored thereon instructions which when executed by a processor cause the machine to perform operations comprising: (Abdelnur: col. 12, lines 42-48)

receiving a file system request involving a remote file system; (Abdelnur: col. 3, line 6, col. 2, lines 34-35)

creating a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) or distributed authoring and versioning (WebDAV) formatted request (HTTP/WebDAV formatted request);

Art Unit: 2155

forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server; (Abdelnur: col. 3, lines 6-10; col. 4, lines 15-20)

receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server; and (Abdelnur: col. 4: 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55)

transferring an information contained in the response. (Abdelnur: col. 4: 32-35; col. 6, lines 53-55; col. 8, lines 41, 42)

Regarding claim 31, the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining the file system request from an operating system extension. (Abdelnur: col. 28-32)

Regarding claim 32, the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a request type.
(Abdelnur: col. 5, lines 6-16; col. 2, lines 42-45)

Regarding claim 33, the machine readable medium of Claim 32 wherein creating comprises:

selecting an appropriate WebDAV/HTTP method responsive to the request type.
(Abdelnur: col. 7, lines 47-56)

Regarding claim 34, the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising:

extracting an information from the response. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 53-55)

Regarding claim 35, the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein extracting comprises:

Art Unit: 2155

converting a WebDAV/HTTP status code to a corresponding local operating system error code. (Abdelnur: col. 4, lines 32-34; col. 11, lines 53-57)

Regarding claim 39, a computer system comprising:

at least one application program; (Abdelnur: col. 10, lines 36-38)

an operating system providing a file system interface; (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 22-32)

an operating system extension to receive from the file system interface of the operating system a request for a remotely stored file that initiated from the application program and to forward the request for the remotely stored file; (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 22-32)

a network access application program to receive the request for the remotely stored file from the operating system extension (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 53-55), to translate a file name information specified in the request from a local file system syntax to a remote server syntax (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 53-55; lines 60-67), and to package the request according to a well known protocol for communication to a user specified remote computer system over a network. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 55-60)

Regarding claim 40, the computer system of Claim 39 wherein the network access application program reformats a response received from the user specified remote computer system (Abdelnur: col. 8, lines 36-42), including reverse translating any file name information from a remote server syntax to a local file system syntax (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 53-55), and forwards a reformatted response to the operating system extension program. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 55-59)

Regarding claim 41, the computer system of Claim 40 wherein the remote server syntax is the syntax of a uniform resource identifier (URI). (Abdelnur: col. 5, lines 6-16; col. 2, lines 42-45)

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 42, a method comprising:

receiving a file system request from an application program; (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 22-32)

if the file system request involves a remote file system on a remote computer system (Abdelnur: col. 1, lines 31-33), forwarding the request to a network access application program which translates a file name information specified in the request from a local file system syntax to a remote server syntax and communicates the request in a well known format to the remote computer system over a wide area network; (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 33-52)

reformatting a response from the remote computer system forwarded by the remote access application program which reverse translates any file name information specified in the response from the remote server syntax to the local file system syntax; and (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 53-55)

transferring the reformatted response to the application program. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 55-59)

Regarding claim 43, the method of Claim 42 wherein receiving comprises:

obtaining the file system request via a local file system interface of an operating system. (Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 22-32)

Regarding claim 44, the method of Claim 42 wherein the remote server syntax is the syntax of a uniform resource identifier (URI). (Abdelnur: col. 5, lines 6-16; col. 2, lines 42-45)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2155

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 by Abdelnur et al ("Abdelnur") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,151 by Cantrell et al ("Cantrell").

The Abdelnur reference teaches a system of sharing resources in a network environment. The Abdelnur reference lacks locally caching requested files from a server.

The Cantrell reference teaches, regarding claim 12, (the method of Claim 10) further comprising:

creating a local cache file to store at least the information. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 36-39)

The Cantrell reference further teaches that the use of the cache manager allows for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of resource sharing in a network environment as taught by Abdelnur while employing a cache manager as taught by Cantrell in order to allow for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Abdelnur and Cantrell.

Regarding claim 13, the method of Claim 12 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the local cache file or at least a portion of the information. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 23-24; Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 54- col. 7, line 4)

Regarding claim 14, the method of Claim 10 further comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

updating a local cache file responsive to the information. (Cantrell: col. 8, lines 15-27; col. 2, lines 6-11)

Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 by Abdelnur et al ("Abdelnur") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,151 by Cantrell et al ("Cantrell").

The Abdelnur reference teaches a system of sharing resources in a network environment. The Abdelnur reference lacks locally caching requested files from a server.

The Cantrell reference teaches, regarding claim 17, (the method of Claim 15,) wherein receiving a response further comprises:

creating a local cache file to store an information extracted from the response.
(Cantrell: col. 3, lines 36-39)

The Cantrell reference further teaches that the use of the cache manager allows for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of resource sharing in a network environment as taught by Abdelnur while employing a cache manager as taught by Cantrell in order to allow for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Claims 18-22 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Abdelnur and Cantrell.

Regarding claim 18, the method of Claim 17 wherein transferring comprises:
passing a file handle to the local cache file or at least a portion of the information.
(Cantrell: col. 5, lines 23-24; Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 54- col. 7, line 4)

Regarding claim 19, the method of Claim 15 further comprising:
updating a local cache file responsive to an information extracted from the response. (Cantrell: col. 8, lines 15-27; col. 2, lines 6-11)

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 20, the method of Claim 15 further comprising:

if the file system request involves a locally cached remote file system, obtaining information responsive to the file system request from a local cache file. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 52-54; col. 8, lines 5-14)

Regarding claim 21, the method of Claim 20 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

extracting a file handle to the locally cached remote file system from the file system request. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 23-24; Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 54- col. 7, line 4)

Regarding claim 22, the method of Claim 20 wherein forwarding the request to a seamless file system, forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request, and receiving a response are bypassed when the file system request involves the locally cached remote file system. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 52-54; col. 8, lines 5-14)

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 by Abdelnur et al ("Abdelnur") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,151 by Cantrell et al ("Cantrell").

The Abdelnur reference teaches a system of sharing resources in a network environment. The Abdelnur reference lacks locally caching requested files from a server.

The Cantrell reference teaches, regarding claim 25, (the machine readable medium of Claim 24) wherein receiving a response comprises:

Art Unit: 2155

if a corresponding local cache file exists, updating the corresponding local cache file responsive to an information extracted from the response; and (Cantrell: col. 8, lines 5- 10)

if the corresponding local cache file does not exist, creating the corresponding local cache file to store the information extracted from the response. (Cantrell: col. 8, lines 10-14)

The Cantrell reference further teaches that the use of the cache manager allows for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of resource sharing in a network environment as taught by Abdelnur while employing a cache manager as taught by Cantrell in order to allow for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Claims 26-29 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Abdelnur and Cantrell.

Regarding claim 26, the machine readable medium of Claim 25 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the corresponding local cache file or at least a portion of the information. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 23-24; Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 54- col. 7, line 4)

Regarding claim 27, the machine readable medium of Claim 23 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising:

if the file system request involves a locally cached remote file system, obtaining information responsive to the file system request from a local cache file. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 52-54; col. 8, lines 5-14)

Regarding claim 28, the machine readable medium of Claim 27 wherein receiving the file system request comprises:

extracting a file handle to the locally cached remote file system from the file system request. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 23-24; Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 54- col. 7, line 4)

Regarding claim 29, the machine readable medium of Claim 27 wherein forwarding the request to a seamless file system, forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request, and receiving a response are bypassed when the file system request involves the locally cached remote file system. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 52-54; col. 8, lines 5-14)

Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 by Abdelnur et al ("Abdelnur") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,151 by Cantrell et al ("Cantrell").

Art Unit: 2155

The Abdelnur reference teaches a system of sharing resources in a network environment. The Abdelnur reference lacks locally caching requested files from a server.

The Cantrell reference teaches, regarding claim 36, (the machine-readable medium of Claim 34) wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising:

creating a local cache file to store at least the information. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 36-39)

The Cantrell reference further teaches that the use of the cache manager allows for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of resource sharing in a network environment as taught by Abdelnur while employing a cache manager as taught by Cantrell in order to allow for continued operation by disconnected clients with effective reconciliation upon reconnection. (Cantrell: col. 3, lines 21-23)

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Abdelnur and Cantrell.

Regarding claim 37, the machine readable medium of Claim 36 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the local cache file or at least a portion of the information. (Cantrell: col. 5, lines 23-24; Abdelnur: col. 6, lines 54- col. 7, line 4)

Regarding claim 38, the machine-readable medium of Claim 34 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising:

updating a local cache file responsive to the information. (Cantrell: col. 8, lines 15-27; col. 2, lines 6-11)

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 5,802,366 issued to Row et al.

U. S. Patent No. 5,778,384 issued to Provino et al.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155



FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

brb
October 1, 2003